

Karner Blue HCP
HCP Monitoring Improvement Team (MIT)
January 25, 2005
9:30 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.
DNR Service Center, Wisconsin Rapids

MINUTES

Attending: Matt Krumenauer, Paul Rasmussen, Tim Wilder, Scott Swengel, Bob Hess, Cathy Carnes, Jaime Thibodeaux (recorder), Dave Lentz
Absent: Joel Aanensen, Paul Kooiker, Rich King

1. Anti-trust statement

Dave Lentz gave the anti-trust statement

2. Review Agenda (5 min.)

- An item on site selection process was added as #5.
- Original agenda items on #8 No Net Loss of Habitat and #9 Shifting Mosaic were folded into discussion on agenda items #4 and #7.

3. Review November meeting (minutes attached) and action items. (20 min.)

Dave- spoke with Jimmy Christenson (DNR legal) regarding the legal ability to protect site-specific data from public distribution if we channel Karner information through NHI.

Cathy feels that if any FWS funding is used it will be subject to FOIA. If FWS has funded that data collection and management, then it's open to public request.

Dave- believes even though it's entered using fed funds, since it's partner-gathered data it's still protected. We may still channel it through NHI data.

ACTION: Dave still needs to meet with both Jimmy C and Betty Les (DNR Endangered Resource) regarding the legal ability to protect location data.

Cathy- (Re: range size of an individual EO could contain multiple KBB sites. Eos do not coincide with a KBB population.) Dale Schweitzer (former Recovery team member) is coming-up with the distance to be used to determine population sites. All sites within a .5 miles will be considered an Element Occurrence, but everything within 2km will be considered one population. Our data would be more specific than NHI data, including separate populations within an Element Occurrence.

LAST ACTION ITEM FROM LAST MEETING: Should we ask the forestry partners to continue to find new population sites?

Dave- Last year we asked SM partners to look at their best level 1 sites (200 in total). Dave would like to continue this. He talked to Joel Aanensen this morning, and he feels he still has many un-surveyed potential sites.

Cathy- I think this is good for SM.

Bob- I think this goes along with pre-management surveys, because they have to survey it before management actions.

Cathy- So your goal is still the same number of sites for forestry partners for level 1?

Dave- Yes. This is for level 1, but partners may use this survey as a pre-management survey and conduct level 2 surveys on the same site as well.

ACTION ITEMS CARRIED OVER FROM 3-10-04 MEETING:

Action	Status and Discussion
Assess existing self-monitoring data to determine if currently used ROW maintenance rotations are appropriate for maintaining KBB populations on POH sites.	<i>This was not done. Working on questionnaire. Cathy conducted a literature search (see below).</i>
Do literature search and look at previous EM data to see if pattern emerges (Matt/Scott). Provide additional literature on impacts of ROW management on KBBs if available (Cathy)	<p>Cathy looked at copy of the ROW management guidelines for lupine response in NY. Doing ROW management in New York: - Found that mean portion of flowering stems (lupine) and average height of clump increased following treatment, but eventually started to decline (after a mean of 4 years). - Concluded that treatment return should be based on the best habitat conditions for KBB, but with minimal impact for KBB. The first 4 yrs is responding well to treatment, after 4 years the canopy is starting to develop. Didn't matter what type of canopy management was conducted. The interval mattered. 5-7 years between treatments was the best for KBB.</p> <p>Scott - This document makes a good point. Regal fritillary, for example, you have to take into account of the immediate negative response to the population, and the time the habitat remains suitable for the wildlife even after succession begins to occur. The frequency of burning needs to take into account the response of both the animals and the vegetation. We also need to know that in NY the vegetation grows faster there.</p> <p>Matt - we need to look at the same sites to see how the vegetation is responding. But we don't have some of that data for post management coverage.</p> <p>Cathy - we would have to add some additional data to, canopy coverage, percent lupine coverage, and percent canopy coverage.</p> <p>Action: Jaime will look into the timeline of encroachment of shrubs in barrens habitat in Wisconsin.</p> <p>Matt - There is a lot of data out there about ROW management.</p> <p>Dave - What do we need to know for our management objectives? We need to know what habitat management to look for... we need to ask the right questions. <i>(To be continued in agenda item #4 discussion.)</i></p>
Paul (Kooiker), work on documenting degree of skips on representative burn units at Crex; Cathy talk to Rich King about a larval study.	<p>(Cathy) Looking at skips. About 20 percent of unit has skips. Using burns in a way that they provide skips for refugia. Student at Georgetown (Catherine McCall) interested in doing research on survival through fire. We would like to discover how larvae survive fire.</p> <p>Tim - We sometimes design burns to have skip where there's low areas from bombs. It is annoying to put in permanent fire breaks.</p> <p>Dave- One of the concerns to me is that putting in firebreaks leads to exotics coming in. We normally mow or fire breaks, and then burning off that line. We try not to use dozers anymore.</p> <p>Action: Cathy - Ask Paul Kooiker to review some of the burn data. Ask Crex to review their burn records to determine the degree of skips for their</p>

	<p>burns. In post-burn skips look at mechanical follow-ups. Might have some GPS data on where their crew worked.</p> <p>Cathy - Can KBB larvae burrow?</p> <p>Scott - Have found 0 larvae in areas burned 100 percent. Only areas where there's skips.</p> <p>Cathy - I'm not sure we need more research on burns. We have a process for conservation with burns to minimize impact. Maybe all we need is help for burn managers.</p> <p>Dave - We have ideas.</p> <p>Cathy - You should provide a handbook for this. There are the management guidelines in the HCP. We could tweak that. They just came out with burn guidelines for the Dakota skipper.</p> <p>Dave - This is not a monitoring issue, so who should develop this further outside this meeting for use in the HCP.</p> <p>Dave & Jaime - review existing information and revise guidelines for prescribed burns. Share draft with Cathy. Make sure it is distributed appropriately.</p> <p>Scott - site for Henslow Sparrows to get burned, asked a manager to not burn it. Managers could just ask the people who do burns to not burn concentrated wildlife areas.</p> <p>Cathy- Maybe we can go to a planning meeting to help them with this. Now all the folks have to fill-out an ER form before burning. In the ER package, there is a list of experts.</p> <p>Sharing of data: Scott shares his and Ann's data. Dave invited Scott to Crex and Sandhill where collaboration has had improved conservation results. There is a good attitude for sharing of data.</p>
Example of exotic species landscape GIS habitat. Use this as an example.	<p>Sent to Matt K., but will be sent out to the entire group.</p> <p>Action: Jaime to resend this to all MIT members.</p>
Revise the chart for "take minimized" and "no take".	<p>Action: Jaime to revise this.</p>
Scott (Bernstein) was to set-up a site-pool to study the sites for the category 2 monitoring uncertainties.	<p>Action: Jaime: Set-up site pools before Feb meeting? as soon as possible. Work with Dave to distribute a second request to partners to submit sites to the pool. Check questionnaire to assure instructions and purpose is clearly stated, and that criteria is still okay. If criteria changes, ask partners who already submitted sites to see if they have additional sites that meet changed criteria.</p>
Develop monitoring protocols for the 10 activities to be studied.	<p>Dave sent these out.</p>
Consider having a discussion of ATV remedies for HCP summer meeting.	<p>Need to have people with exposure to the issue. i.e. Jon Schweitzer (Jackson County Forest). Invite someone who belongs to an ATV club.</p> <p>Carry-over the action of ATV issues to the summer meeting.</p>

Action: Dave – Talk to Wayne Hall about follow-up report from Keith Rice on latest satellite imagery efforts.

4. Setting Goals for Monitoring & Adaptive Management – Asking the right questions. (20 min.) **Presentation/instruction**

Discussion during presentation:

Matt - If our goal is habitat, how can we measure this goal if we don't know what habitat is? Do we need an index of habitat? Is KBB percentage a measurable index of habitat?

Dave - How can we know that we're replacing habitat to balance the loss? This is not likely achievable in absolute terms. What we can do is to validate the process/guidelines, then assure we are following the guidelines and protocols correctly.

Matt - Can no net loss of habitat be applied via our management actions, meaning that we must prove that our management actions are not contributing to no net loss of habitat, or do we have to prove on a large-scale picture that no habitat is being lost?

Cathy - Proving management actions provide loss of habitat answer will not work with our forestry partners.

Dave - For shifting mosaic, this may be too difficult to do for all sites and all lands included, but it may have value if looked at just for KBB occupied sites.

Scott - Level 2 gives a good index of habitat. Should we just look for Karners for monitoring?

Dave - Partners never said no net loss of Karners, just habitat. Partners didn't feel they could guarantee Karners because for a variety of reasons KBB may not colonize all potential habitat.

Bob - Partners may provide habitat, that's not occupied because it's not within dispersal distance. Do we need to find an index of habitat quality? Maybe just habitat period.

Dave - I believe we have to prove what we do on the landscape, and the way we do it, provides suitable habitat.

Bob - Can we define habitat, then monitor our management practices and the vegetation situation that exists afterwards?

Dave - Habitat is where there's the right vegetation, open canopy, and dispersal options, etc.

Dave presented process information on developing management and monitoring objectives.

5. Site selection process: discussion (Scott Swengel)

Scott presented moth study that suggests we need long-term monitoring. This study monitored the trends in moths over several years on several sites. He also, presented his information regarding site-selection. He has data that compares monitoring sites remaining the same vs monitoring sites that change every year. The monitoring of the same sites repeatedly is more valuable than monitoring random sites because they are more statistically valuable. In our case, HCP partners have sites in 3 categories: 1) SM, 2) POH, 3) Reserve sites (both). The reserve sites out-perform the others (Dike 17), areas where they (the managers) are trying to pay attention to conservation or KBB. A distinction should be made in our analysis. We can monitor sites over long periods of time and watch for colonization and site extinction. His study even shows Central WI populations are on the decline based on one means of looking at the data, but its not ideal data. Will send this data when it is finished to make this more clear.

Bob - We discussed last time eliminating level 3 monitoring except on recovery properties, and on the forestry sites being studied for cause-effect monitoring (category 2 of uncertainty). We will need some level 3 sites on the POH sites on recovery property to study this effect of management on KBB abundance.

6. Cause and Effect Monitoring: Review existing self-monitoring data (20 min.)

- **Review "Adaptive Management Studies" Candidate Site Questionnaire Submissions.**
- **Discuss next steps to complete site pool and fill data gaps.**

Jaime presented information on the Site Questionnaire Submissions. The majority of the partners have not returned their site questionnaires which tell us the monitoring information on specific sites before and after any of the 10 management activities. Those who have returned their information have not conducted many post-management surveys, and most likely have not completed the form accurately. Paul Rasmussen and Jaime met regarding the number of sites needed for statistical analysis of these management activities. The magic number was approximately 20 sites. There are 3 and possibly 4 management activities which may meet these criteria following another round of questionnaire

distribution. We would like to see partners conduct post monitoring on the majority of their sites in these categories. All agree that the information from this data is very useful information.

We have many self-monitoring forms which are submitted with the annual reports. We could go through these. Reportedly, many partners were not submitting their self monitoring forms. Therefore there are still potentially a significant number of self-monitoring surveys that are sitting in many partners' files.

Why did so many partners not submit these questionnaires? Are they intimidated? Are the directions confusing? Jaime thinks this should be relatively easy. Matt and Dave think the directions were very clear.

Action: Jaime will send a copy of the revised site questionnaire to Bob and Matt before the Winter Meeting to review and revise before sending to partners again.

In addition, monitoring forms have been revised to include a box to check if the monitoring is pre-, post-, or on-going management, date of management, and the partner site code. The annual reports have also been revised to include partner site codes in the management section.

Action: Jaime will work with Dave to re-distribute the questionnaire a second time.

7. Filled out monitoring planning chart (see attached chart)

Note: Charting is not complete. This was an exercise to fill out only one example. There is much more to do.

ACTION: Dave to ask Paula Kleintjes about nectar plant criteria for KBB.

There was a lengthy discussion while filling out the chart regarding:

- Quantity of habitat vs. quality
- How to define habitat, what are our indexes?
- If habitat is our goal or if KBBs are our goal.

Action: Bob & Joel (forestry), Matt (corridor and rotation), Dave (other), using the chart exercise from the meeting to fill out charts for the management activities in category 2 level of uncertainty from earlier MIT work.

#8 & #9 covered in discussion in context of earlier agenda items.

8. No Net Loss of Habitat

Discuss issue and develop goals and objectives for monitoring and management.

Discussed during the filling-out of the chart.

9. Shifting Mosaic – How to demonstrate SM works (60 min.)

Discuss issue and develop goals and objectives for monitoring and management. *Discussed during the filling out of the chart.*

10. Closing (15 min.)

- Summarize action items & assignments.
- Schedule another meeting (March 7th tentatively)

Summary of Actions From This Meeting

Person	Action	Due Date
Dave	1) Meet with Betty Les and Jimmy C regarding the legal protection of location data through NHI with federal funding.	Before Feb. 16 HCP Team meeting
Jaime	2) Research the timeline of shrub encroachment on barrens habitat.	Before next MIT meeting
Cathy	3) See if Paul Kooiker can review some of the burn data for skips.	Before next MIT meeting
Jaime Dave Cathy	4) Review existing information and revise guidelines for prescribed fire management.	No deadline. Ball is in Dave's court.
Jaime	5) Re-send all of the exotics GIS information to the group	Soon
Jaime	6) Revise the chart for "take minimized" and "no take"	Before next MIT meeting
Dave Jaime	7) Give an explanation for what we are doing for monitoring this year.	Before Winter HCP meeting
Bob, Joel, Dave, Matt	8) Fill out monitoring planning chart for the category of uncertainty #2 management activities. (Ultimately to develop monitoring and sampling designs.) When drafts of the chart are done, send to MIT for review and comment.	March 1 to MIT members for review.
All	9) Consider having an ATV representative come to the summer meeting.	Forward topic to IOC for summer meeting planning.
Jaime	10) Revise "Site Activity Questionnaire" and send to Matt and Bob for their review.	As soon as possible before winter meeting
Dave	11) Ask Paula Kleintjes about nectar plant criteria for KBB habitat	Before next MIT meeting
Jaime	12) Send-out a confirmation for the next MIT meeting scheduled for March 9th	By Friday, Jan 28